

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims and specification are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application with claims 6, 10, 14, 18, 20, 22 and 24-26 being independent. The Examiner has withdrawn claims 1-5 and 24-26 from consideration.

I. Reference to Prior Provisional Application

The Office Action states that applicants have not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e). Specifically, the Office Action states that applicants claim priority of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905, but do not have a specific reference at page 1 of the specification as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5).

Applicants have amended the specification to include the required claim for priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905. Therefore, applicants submit that all conditions for receiving the benefit of the earlier filing date of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905 have been satisfied under 35 U.S.C. 119(e).

II. Objections to Disclosure

The Office Action objects to the disclosure due to typographical errors at page 8, line 3, in the specification. Applicants have amended the specification at page 8, lines 3-4, to correct the typographical errors and for purposes of general clarification. No new matter has been added. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure is respectfully requested.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (US 2002/0091706, provisionally filed on September 6, 2000 as SN 60/230,274). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The present application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905 filed on June 12, 2000, which predates the earliest effective filing date of Anderson et al. of September 6, 2000. Applicants assert that the subject matter of rejected claims 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16 are fully supported under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 by U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905. For example, support for the subject matter of claims 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16 may be found at least on pages 9-12 and Figures 1 and 4 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905. Therefore, applicants submit that Anderson et al. is not prior art with respect to rejected claims 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16 of the present application, and that claims 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16 are allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-8, 10-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Obviousness in View of Anderson et al. and Li

The Office Action rejects claims 9, 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. in view of Li (US 6,609,050). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, the present application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905 filed on June 12, 2000, which predates the earliest effective filing date of Anderson et al. of September 6, 2000. Applicants assert that the subject matter of rejected claims 9, 13 and 17 are fully supported under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 by U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905. For example, support for the subject matter of

claims 9, 13 and 17 may be found at least on pages 9-12 and Figures 1 and 4 of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905. Therefore, applicants submit that Anderson et al. is not prior art with respect to rejected claims 9, 13 and 17 of the present application.

Li discloses a vehicle warranty and repair computer-networked system with a customer user interface (see Fig. 7; abstract). However, Li by itself does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations included in claims 9, 13 and 17. Further, applicants assert that combining the teachings of Li with Anderson et al. is improper, since Anderson et al. is not prior art with respect to claims 9, 13 and 17. Therefore, claims 9, 13 and 17 are allowable over the combination of Anderson et al. in view of Li.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

B. Obviousness in View of Stoyanov et al.

The Office Action rejects claims 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoyanov et al. (US 2002/0123961, provisionally filed on January 25, 2001 as SNs 60/264,646 and 60/264,595). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, the present application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905 filed on June 12, 2000, which predates the earliest effective filing date of Stoyanov et al. of January 25, 2001. Applicants assert that the subject matter of rejected claims 18-23 are fully supported under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 by U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905. For example, support for the subject matter of claims 18-23 may be found at least on pages 12-14, 20, and Figures 5(a)-(b) and 6(a)-(b) of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/210,905. Therefore, applicants submit that Stoyanov et al. is not prior art with respect to the claims of the present application, and that claims 18-23 are allowable.

For at least the reasons above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner believe that this application is in condition for disposition other than allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below in order to address the Examiner's concerns.

Please apply any necessary charges owed, or credits due, to Deposit Account 50-1721.

Date: _____

25 APR 05

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen C. Glazier
Reg. No. 31,361
(202) 778-9045

Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Nicholson Graham LLP
1800 Massachusetts Ave., NW
2nd Floor
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 778-9000
Fax: (202) 778-9100